

REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, none of the claims now pending in the application are unpatentable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 103. Several claims are amended to address various informalities. Thus, all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9, 11-20 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being un-patentable over Campbell et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,871,193 B1, issued on March 22, 2005, hereinafter referred to as "Campbell" in view of Bansal et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120593 A1, published on June 26, 2003, hereinafter referred to as "Bansal." The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Campbell describes an authentication bundle that supports authentication and authorization of users. (See e.g., Campbell, Column 11, Lines 25-55; and Column 18, Lines 51-67).

Bansal describes a messaging service that decouples interacting applications to allow for flexibility in keeping inter-dependencies to a minimum. For example, a front-office application can continue to operate even if a back-office application is momentarily down. The messaging service has the characteristic to provision prioritizing the message processing. (See e.g., Bansal, Paragraphs [0641] - [0646], [0721] - [0728] and [0869] - [0871]).

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Campbell and Bansal, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to describe or suggest a system or a method for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a common customer identifier associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein the common customer identifier provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer, as positively claimed by the independent claims 1 and 12. Specifically, the independent claims 1 and 12 recite:

1. A unified shared business application system, comprising:
 - a unified portal for authenticating and authorizing user preferences and restrictions;
 - an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates the common customer identifier associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein the common customer identifier provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer;
 - an integrated business applications system for integrating a plurality of business applications across products and services to produce integrated business applications in response to authorized user selections of a business application from the unified portal; and
 - a database warehouse for storing information associated with the business channels of the plurality of enterprises, each user, and the products and services, wherein at least one of: the unified portal, the enterprise function module, the integrated business applications system or the database warehouse is implemented via a processor. (Emphasis added).

12. A method of unifying and sharing business applications with respect to a user of a business channel, comprising:
 - authenticating and authorizing, at a unified portal of a server, user preferences and restrictions in response to a user request for access;
 - providing, at an enterprise function module of the server, a common customer identifier for users associated with a plurality of business channels of an enterprise, wherein the enterprise function module associates the common customer identifier to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein the common customer identifier provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer;
 - integrating, at an integrated applications system of the server, in response to a user selection of a business application, information associated across a plurality of business applications with respect to products and services to produce integrated business applications in response to authorized user selections of a business application from the unified portal; and
 - storing, at a database warehouse of the server, information associated with the business channels, each user, and the products and services. (Emphasis added).

In one embodiment, the present disclosure describes a system and a method, for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier for users associated

with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a common customer identifier associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein the common customer identifier provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. (See e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0055] and [0058]). The disclosure describes that the user is associated with a common customer identifier number and the common customer identifier is used to identify a user with a particular enterprise. Additionally, from the perspective of the carrier, the common customer identifier provides indicia of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. In one example, the common customer identifier is used to provide priority to customers that have higher priority ratings.

The alleged combination (as described by Campbell) fails to describe or suggest a system or a method for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a common customer identifier associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein the common customer identifier an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer.

The Examiner again argues that Campbell describes a common customer identifier that provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. However, the cited paragraph is only concerned with whether a customer has authorization to access a service and thus whether access should be granted or denied. As such, the section cited by the Examiner in the Office Action in Campbell only discloses a typical authorization process, i.e., a user can access the service if the user is authorized. The Examiner's attention is directed to Campbell, Column 11, Lines 25-55 and Column 13, Lines 56-66. In fact, Campbell teaches away from the present disclosure. Campbell only describes user preferences being used to provide customized presentation to customers. The portal page is able to present information that a particular user indicated as information of interest to the user.

In the Office Action dated May 12, 2010, page 3, the Examiner argues Campbell describes a common customer identifier. However, the cited paragraph only describes identifiers of individual users. (See Campbell, Column 11, Lines 38-43). Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the biometric data, fingerprints, retinal scans, etc. are not used as a common customer identifier. In fact, they are used to uniquely identify each user. The Examiner is also directed to Campbell, Column 17, Lines 64-67, in which the use of the unique identifier is described. As pointed out by the Examiner, Campbell identifies each user via the biometrics. Campbell is simply not concerned with a common customer identifier for users associated with a plurality of business channels. In stark contrast, the present disclosure describes the common customer identifier being associated with the plurality of business channels.

In the Office Action dated May 12, 2010, page 3, the Examiner also argues that Campbell describes ACL (access control list) and then proceeds to conclude Campbell describes or suggests common customer identifier. It is respectfully submitted that the common customer identifier described in the disclosure is not simply used to grant or deny access, as argued by the Examiner. First, the common customer identifier enables providing different levels of priority to customers and therefore provides different services for customers that have higher priority ratings. The disclosure describes providing priority to customers that have higher priority ratings by simply using the common customer identifier. For example, the common customer identifier is used to determine the priority, such that customers who have higher priority ratings will be treated preferentially than those customers with lower priority ratings. Hence, a common customer identifier is clearly not an access control list. Second, the disclosure describes using the common customer identifier directly to provide indicia of priority for servicing. In contrast, Campbell is using an authentication service for determining priority. The present disclosure advantageously enables the service provider to provide the appropriate level of service by simply using the common customer identifier without the need for further requirement on the user.

Moreover, Bansal does not bridge the substantial gap left by Campbell because Bansal also fails to describe or suggest a system or a method for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a common customer identifier associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein the common customer identifier provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer.

The Examiner again argues that Bansal describes common customer identifier provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. However, the paragraphs in Bansal only describe decoupling of back-office and front office processes and prioritizing of messages in queue. (See Bansal, Paragraphs [0641] - [0646], [0721] - [0728], and [0869] – [0871]). Bansal only describes a messaging service that decouples interacting applications to allow for flexibility in keeping inter-dependencies to a minimum. For example, a front-office application can continue to operate even if a back-office application is momentarily down. The messaging service has the characteristic to provision prioritizing of the processing of the message in the queue. Bansal fails to describe any prioritization based on the common customer identifier. Bansal only describes priorities of messaging queues and a scheduler. The mere fact of having a priority is not relevant to the present disclosure. The present disclosure specifically describes a common customer identifier that provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. The common customer identifier as described in the disclosure advantageously enables the service provider to provide the appropriate level of service by simply using the common customer identifier without the need for further requirement on the user. Therefore, Bansal fails to close the significant gap left by Campbell. Thus, for all the above reasons, claims 1 and 12 are not made obvious by the combination of Campbell and Bansal.

Moreover, dependent claims 2-9, 11, 13-20 and 22 depend from independent claims 1 and 12, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As

such, and for the exact same reason set forth above with regard to independent claims 1 and 12 being patentable over Campbell and Bansal, claims 2-9, 11, 13-20 and 22 are also patentable over Campbell and Bansal. As such, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


Thus, all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 542-2280 Ext. 130 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

August 12, 2010

Wall & Tong, LLP
25 James Way
Eatontown, New Jersey 07724


Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 542-2280, Ext. 130